

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

Travis Leon Davidson,  
Plaintiff,

vs.

Robert Ratliff, Nicole Mace, Wesley  
Robinson,  
Defendants.

)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

C.A. No.: 4:11-cv-01072-RBH

**ORDER**

Plaintiff, a federal prisoner proceeding *pro se*, brought this complaint on a form captioned for inmate civil rights cases pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Shiva V. Hodges, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Neither party has filed objections to the Report and Recommendation.<sup>1</sup> In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005) stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct *de novo* review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'” (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note).

After a thorough review of the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is adopted and incorporated by reference. Therefore, it is

**ORDERED** that this case is dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/R. Bryan Harwell  
R. Bryan Harwell  
United States District Judge

Florence, South Carolina  
July 22, 2011

---

<sup>1</sup> As a matter of fact, Plaintiff failed to file objections even after receiving an extension of time in which to do so. Plaintiff's objections were originally due by June 20, 2011. On June 16, 2011, upon motion by Plaintiff, the court extended the deadline for filing objections until July 11, 2011. *See* [Docket Entry 20]. The court thereafter denied Plaintiff's request for a further extension. *See* [Docket Entry 24]. Plaintiff has failed to file any objections to date.